

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 GENEVA 06577 261455Z

73

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 IO-04 ACDA-05 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-03 INR-05 L-01

NSAE-00 PA-01 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 DODE-00 H-01 NSC-05 SS-15 OIC-02 CU-02 SAM-01

/069 W

----- 007459

R 261412Z OCT 74

FM USMISSION GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 8904

USMISSION NATO BRUSSELS

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

C O N F I D E N T I A L GENEVA 6577

EO 11652: GDS

TAGS: CSCE, PFOR, XG

SUBJ: CSCE: MBFR LINKAGE

BONN HOLD FOR COUNSELOR SONNENFELDT AND ASSISTANT SECRETARY
HARTMAN

REF: (A) USNATO 5945

(B) USNATO 5946

1. SUMMARY. REFTELS SUGGEST THAT SITUATION IN CSCE,
AND POSSIBILITIES FOR INFLUENCING COURSE OF EVENTS
HERE, ARE NOT CLEARLY UNDERSTOOD BY SOME SPC REPS
OR BY NATO IS. WE BELIEVE THAT IT IS MISLEADING TO
THINK IN TERMS OF POSSIBLE "CONCESSIONS" WHICH WOULD
HAVE TO BE MADE IN CSCE IN ORDER TO OBTAIN MOVEMENT
BY EASTERN SIDE IN VIENNA. RATHER, NATO DISCUSSIONS
SHOULD, IN OUR VIEW, FOCUS ON POSSIBILITIES FOR
CONTROLLING PACE OF PROGRESS ON CSCE, IN RELATION TO
PROGRESS IN MBFR. SUCH AN APPROACH WOULD OFFER
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 GENEVA 06577 261455Z

POSSIBILITIES FOR LEVERAGE ON SOVIETS WHICH ARE

REALISTIC AND SHOULD NOT CALL INTO QUESTION SUBSTANTIVE POSITIONS ON CSCE ISSUES. FOLLOWING COMMENTS ARE INTENDED ONLY TO CLARIFY THE OPTIONS REALISTICALLY AVAILABLE, AND NOT REPEAT NOT TO MAKE ANY RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING REVERSE LINKAGE. END SUMMARY.

1. PARA 5 OF IS DRAFT IN THIS ISSUE (REF B) IS UNREALISTIC IN SAYING ALLIES WOULD HAVE TO AGREE ON PRECISELY WHAT PROPOSALS THEY WERE PREPARED TO MAKE IN CSCE TO GET A GIVEN RESULT IN VIENNA. NOR IS IT A MATTER OF CHOOSING, AS CANADIAN SPC REP SUGGESTED (PARA 5 REF A), BETWEEN "ABANDONING WESTERN DESIDERATA" AND A "SLOWDOWN" IN GENEVA.

2. WE SERIOUSLY DOUBT THERE EXISTS ANY CLEAR-CUT DEFINITION OF THE AIMS OF INDIVIDUAL ALLIED DELEGATIONS COVERING ALL THE MAJOR CONTENTIOUS ISSUES WHERE -- MUCH LESS A COLLECTIVE ALLIED CONSENSUS ON THE MATTER. SOME DELEGATIONS FEEL STRONGLY ABOUT CERTAIN PARTICULAR ISSUES, BUT NONE COULD DEFINE IN ADVANCE WHAT KIND OF OVERALL OUTCOME IT WOULD ULTIMATELY SETTLE FOR. SUCH JUDGEMENTS WILL NECESSARILY EMERGE ONLY IN FINAL PHASE OF NEGOTIATION. THERE IS THEREFORE NO REPEAT NO BENCHMARK AGAINST WHICH TO MEASURE THE "CONCESSIONS" MENTIONED IN PARA 5 OF IS PAPER. THIS IS PARTICULARLY TRUE IN BASKET III, WHERE NUANCES OF LANGUAGE ARE THE STUFF OF THE NEGOTIATIONS. (IT MIGHT BE LESS TRUE OF CBM'S WHEN THE MOST DIFFICULT ISSUES WILL ULTIMATELY REDUCE THEMSELVES TO A MATTER OF NUMBERS).

3. REALISTICALLY, WITH RESPECT TO BASKET III ISSUES NOT ALREADY VIRTUALLY SETTLED OR IN AN ADVANCED STATE OF NEGOTIATION, THERE ARE:
A) AN OPENING WESTERN POSITION, USUALLY IN THE FORM OF AN EC-NINE PAPER; B) ONE OR MORE UNWRITTEN AND UNDEFINED FALLBACK POSITIONS (EXPECT WHERE THEY HAVE BEEN SET OUT IN THE "MORE REALISTIC TEXTS" WHICH WE ARE ENCOURAGING THE ALLIES TO AGREE
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 GENEVA 06577 261455Z

UPON); C) AN ULTIMATE FALLBACK POSITION THAT IS ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE TO JUDGE IN ADVANCE. THE POINT HERE IS THAT CSCE COULD BE SLOWED DOWN IF THE ALLIES SIMPLY HOLD ON LONGER THAN THEY MIGHT OTHERWISE DO TO THEIR INITIAL BASKET III FALLBACK POSITIONS (POINT B IN THE ABOVE SCHEME). WHEN THE SOVIETS COMPLAIN, HINTS COULD BE DROPPED ABOUT THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ALLIED APPROACH IN GENEVA

AND THE SLOW PACE IN VIENNA. THEN IF THE EASTERN BLOC MAKES THE REQUISITE GESTURES IN VIENNA, ALLIES COULD MOVE THEN TO THEIR FINAL FALLBACK POSITION (POINT C). THAT POSITION WOULD BE THE SAME, WITH OR WITHOUT LINKAGE. WITH LINKAGE, WE COULD SIMPLY TAKE LONGER TO GET THERE. PARA 5 OF THE IS PAPER SHOULD, WE SUGGEST, BE REWRITTEN TO REFLECT THIS.

4. NOR DO THE ALLIES NEED ARTIFICIALLY TO SLOW DOWN CSCE STAGE II, AS SUGGESTED BY CANADIAN SPC REP (PARA 5 REF A). THEY NEED ONLY TURN A DEAF EAR TO EASTERN PROPOSALS TO SPEED UP THE GENEVA TALKS, WHICH SIMULTANEOUSLY MAKING ALLUSIONS TO THE DEADLOCK IN VIENNA. IT SHOULD BE KEPT IN MIND THAT IF THE DISCUSSIONS HERE GO ON AT THEIR CURRENT SNAIL'S PACE, STAGE II COULD EASILY RUN INTO MID - 1975 OR BEYOND WITHOUT ANY ADDITIONAL FOOTDRAGGING BY ANYBODY.

5. FOR EXAMPLE, IN THE PRINCIPLES DECLARATION, WE HAVE ONLY "PROVISIONALLY REGISTERED" SIX OF TEN PRINCIPLES. WE HAVE MET ABOUT FORTY TIMES ON PRINCIPLES OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND STILL HAVE NOT FINISHED IT. EVEN AFTER THE TEN PRINCIPLES ARE PROVISIONALLY REGISTERED, A "SECOND READING" WILL BE NEEDED TO CLEAR UP MUCH BRACKETED LANGUAGE IN THE PROVISIONALLY REGISTERED TEXTS. AND DISCUSSIONS HAVE YET TO BEGIN ON PREAMBLE TO PRINCIPLES DECLARATION OR ON ITS FINAL CLAUSES.

6. THE ASSUMPTION HAS ALWAYS BEEN THAT AT A GIVEN MOMENT, THE PACE OF WORK HERE WOULD QUICKEN, PERHAPS

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 GENEVA 06577 261455Z

FOLLOWING A SUBSTANTIVE BREAKTHROUGH IN BASKET III, AND THAT THE DRAFTING WOULD THEREAFTER GO FORWARD MUCH FASTER ON PRINCIPLES AND OTHER ISSUES. THIS COULD EASILY BE ACCOMPLISHED, BUT IT WOULD REQUIRE CONSCIOUS EFFORTS TO CHANGE PRESENT WORK METHODS, DECISIONS TO ORGANIZE MORE SMALLY, INFORMAL SESSIONS AND SO ON.

7. IN SUM, ALLIES WOULD NOT HAVE TO ACT TO SPIN OUT THE GENEVA TALKS. THEY COULD SIMPLY REFRAIN, AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME, FROM JOINING FULLY IN EFFORTS TO SPEED THEM UP.

8. TO OPTIONS SUGGESTED BY NETHERLANDS REP (PARA 7 REF A), WE THUS SUGGEST THAT TWO MORE BE

ADDED: A) ALLIES HOLD FIRMLY TO THEIR
SUBSTANTIVE POSITIONS ON SELECTED BASKET III AND
CBM ISSUES, DELAYING CONCESSIONS UNTIL SOVIETS
ARE MORE FORTHCOMING IN VIENNA; B) ALLIES WOULD
BE LESS THAN FULLY RESPONSIVE, AT THE APPROPRIATE
TIME, TO EASTERN PLEAS TO COOPERATE IN MAKING PRO-
CEDURAL ADJUSTMENTS ESSENTIAL TO AN EARLY CONCLUSION
OF STAGE II, NOTING, IN RESPONSE TO EASTERN
APPROACHES, THE SLOW PACE OF PROGRESS IN VIENNA.

9. WE DO NOT UNDERSTIMATE THE DIFFICULTY OF
PERSUADING THE ALLIES TO FOLLOW, IN PRACTICE, EITHER
OF THE ABOVE COURSES. INDEED, WE ASSUME THE
ARTIFICIALLY "ANTI-LINKAGE" CAST OF THE IS DRAFT
REFLECTS AN UNDERLYING ALLIED DISTASTE FOR LINKAGE.
WE DO BELIEVE, HOWEVER, THAT THE IS PAPER SHOULD
STATE THE OPTIONS MORE FAIRLY.

10. WHILE WE DO NOT REPEAT NOT SUGGEST POINT SHOULD
BE MADE TO ALLIES, DEPT AND USNATO SHOULD BEAR
IN MIND THAT MOSCOW COULD VERY QUICKLY ALL BUT
FORCLOSE THE OPTION OF USING CSCE STAGE II TALKS
AS LEVERAGE ON MBFR BY MAKING A FEW CONCESSIONS IN
BASKET III. FOR EXAMPLE, IF SOVIETS SHOW ENOUGH
FLEXIBILITY ON THE HUMAN CONTACTS PACKAGE NOW
BEING PUT TOGETHER (SEE SEPTTEL ON CSCE HIGHLIGHTS)
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 GENEVA 06577 261455Z

TO CONCLUDE A DEAL IN A WEEK OR TEN DAYS, THE
ALLIES WOULD HAVE EVEN LESS STOMACH FOR DOING
ANYTHING HERE TO BRING PRESSURE ON SOVIETS IN VIENNA.
ABRAMS

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: COLLECTIVE SECURITY, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS, FOREIGN POLICY POSITION, POLITICAL SITUATION, INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 26 OCT 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974GENEVA06577
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D740306-0936
From: GENEVA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19741014/aaaaakzk.tel
Line Count: 205
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: (A) USNATO 5945
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 27 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <27 MAR 2002 by elyme>; APPROVED <23 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CSCE: MBFR LINKAGE BONN HOLD FOR COUNSELOR SONNENFELDT AND ASSISTANT SECRETARY
TAGS: PFOR, XG, CSCE
To: STATE NATO BRUSSELS
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005